DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 463 906 RC 023 375

AUTHOR Nielsen, Marianne O.
TITLE The Impact of Colonialism on Leadership in Indigenous-Operated Justice Organizations: Some Preliminary Thoughts.
PUB DATE 2000-05-00
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Indigenous and Native Studies Association (CINSA) (Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, May 28-31, 2000).
AVAILABLE FROM For full text: http://www.ualberta.ca/~nativest/CINSA/CDfiles/papers/Nielsen.pdf.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; Administrator Role; *Agencies; *American Indians; Colonialism; *Community Services; Cultural Influences; Human Services; Institutional Environment; *Justice; *Leadership; Leadership Qualities; *Program Administration; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS Tribal Courts

ABSTRACT

This paper examines aspects of leadership in four Canadian and U.S. organizations that provide justice-related services to Indigenous people, focusing on the influences of culture and colonial legacy on Indigenous leadership. Located in western Canada and the Southwest United States, the agencies provide culturally sensitive and knowledgeable services to Indigenous offenders and those at risk of offending and are key initiatives in Indigenous peoples' efforts to regain sovereignty. Services include youth crime-prevention programs, legal assistance, alternative sentencing advice, prisoner education, probation and parole programs, and after-care services such as substance abuse counseling. Following descriptions of their histories and services, the four organizations are analyzed with regard to four dimensions of leadership: (1) administrative structure and the leader's position within the organization; (2) organizational environment (demographic, economic, legal, political, technological, ecological, and cultural); (3) individual characteristics reflecting Indigenous leadership qualities; and (4) leader-subordinate relationship and leadership style. In these organizations, the leader's ability to "define the reality of others" was critical to organizational survival. Indigenous leaders must have the skills and knowledge to overcome colonial attitudes and redefine Indigenous organizations as competent and worthy of receiving resources while simultaneously meeting the sometimes conflicting expectations of Indigenous communities and mainstream justice organizations. (Contains 35 references.) (SV)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original document.

ED 463 906

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Marianne O. Nielsen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

The Impact of Colonialism on Leadership in Indigenous-Operated Justice Organizations: Some Preliminary Thoughts*

**A paper presented at the CINSA Annual Meeting,
Edmonton, AB, May 28-31, 2000**

Marianne O. Nielsen
Associate Professor
Criminal Justice
Box 15005
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ 86011-5005
E-Mail: m.nielsen@nau.edu

*** Grateful acknowledgments are made to the many members of the four organizations who generously shared their information, insights, suggestions, and time.**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RC 023375

Introduction

Leadership in Indigenous-designed and operated [1] justice organizations in Canada and the United States must adapt to internal and external environments that differ significantly from those of non-Indigenous criminal justice organizations. Colonial processes in both countries over the years have led to the development of organizational environments different from those experienced by non-Indigenous justice organizations. Indigenous justice organizations not only have had to develop internal structures and environmental relationships that ensure organizational survival but also meet the occasionally unique needs of their clients. One of the most important results of this situation is that organizational leadership has had to learn to function effectively in two very different cultural milieus–the Indigenous communities and the non-Indigenous criminal justice system.

In both countries social disorganization occurred as rapid population decreases resulted from disease, war and slavery (USA), massacres, and geographic displacement. Because of government policies of assimilation, economic and political marginalization, and legal suppression[2], Indigenous peoples lost their autonomy and were forced to operate many of their social institutions in secret or in modified forms.

---

[1] Because terminology varies between the United States (American Indians, Native Americans) and Canada (First Nations, Aboriginal Peoples, Native Peoples), the term Indigenous Peoples is used throughout the paper. The most appropriate definition is perhaps the one provided by Morse (1985:1): "people who trace their ancestors in these lands to time immemorial."

[2] This discussion of colonialism is by necessity, very brief. For good overviews of colonial processes in the United States, see Hagan (1993) and Wright (1992); for an overview of processes in Canada, see Miller (1989) and Trigger (1985). For good discussions of the impact of colonial processes on Indigenous justice practices, see Boldt (1993) on Canada, and Deloria and Lytle (1983) on the United States.

Indigenous peoples, for example, were pressured by missionaries, boarding schools and government officials to exchange Indigenous cultural/spiritual practices, values, and beliefs for various Christian faiths; were forced to move to reservations or reserves so that settlers could take their land; and were prevented from governing the reservations or voting until early in the 20th century. Their traditional practices related to social control, education, marriage, leadership and other important social institutions were forbidden by law until the early and mid-20th century. In general, the changes brought about by colonization affected Indigenous demographics, technology, economic systems, ecology, culture, law and politics. These ethnocidal practices were rationalized on the part of the non-Indigenous peoples by ideologies of Social Darwinism and paternalism. Social Darwinism was the belief that humans, specifically northern European, Christian, upper-class males, were the pinnacle of evolution and therefore had the right to impose their culture, economy, laws, and religion on "inferior" peoples. Paternalism supported this belief in that Indigenous peoples were considered "like children" and therefore incapable of operating their own economies, laws and governments (Nielsen, 1996b).

These forces have left a legacy of group and individual dysfunction in many Indigenous communities, including substance abuse, family violence, suicide and criminal behavior (see, for example, Bachman, 1992; Grobsmith, 1994; Mail and Johnson, 1993; Nielsen and Silverman, 1996; Silverman and Nielsen, 1992). Indigenous-operated justice organizations were established because of the ineffectiveness of the Euro-based criminal justice system in providing services to Indigenous offenders and Indigenous people at risk of offending. In both countries Indigenous peoples are over-represented as offenders. In Canada they are the largest minority group involved in the

criminal justice system (Finn et al, 1999); in the U.S. they are a small but significant proportion. African American and Latino/a offenders are the largest groups, but Indigenous people are still over-represented in some states and in some offence categories (U.S. Government, 1999).

In both countries, it is the belief of Indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous criminal justice systems personnel that Indigenous organizations can provide more culturally-sensitive and knowledgeable services to Indigenous offenders and people at-risk of offending. It is also the belief of many Indigenous people that these organizations are key initiatives (intentionally or unintentionally) in the process of regaining sovereignty for Indigenous peoples (see, for example, Nielsen, 1993).

Despite the importance of these organizations to the criminal justice system and to the cause of increased Indigenous sovereignty, very little research of any kind has been done on them, especially from an organizational perspective (see Redpath and Nielsen, 1997; Nielsen, 1993). Scholarly writing on leadership in general (as opposed to lower-level management) is very rare (Hall, 1999), and research on leadership in non-European based cultures is even rarer (Scott, 1998). The few studies on Indigenous leadership have focused primarily on describing the roles of Elders, political leaders and entrepreneurs (see, for example, Jules, 1988; Boldt, 1980; Wuttunee, 1992; Mankiller and Wallis, 1993) By focusing on four key influences on leadership in Indigenous justice organizations, it is hoped that this paper will add one more building block to the scholarly literature on leadership and on Indigenous organizations, as well as providing a useful tool for administrators in Indigenous organizations. This

paper is only preliminary [3]. It is based on data being collected from four Indigenous justice organizations in the United States and Canada that provide services primarily at the prevention and court stages of the criminal justice system. It is hoped that eventually these organizations will be joined by data from additional Indigenous organizations in Canada, the USA, Australia and New Zealand, so that a more global perspective on the impact of colonialism on Indigenous justice organizations can be developed.

The Organizations

There are a wide variety of Indigenous-designed and operated service agencies at each stage of the criminal justice system in Canada and the USA. There are more than can be described succinctly in this paper, but the following overview should give a brief picture of where the case study organizations fit in. To prevent arrest are organizations that provide programs such as youth recreational, educational, and cultural programs; youth-Elder programs; wilderness survival camps; parenting programs; life skills programs; and counseling programs. At the arrest stage, some Nations have their own police forces with limited jurisdictions. Next, some agencies provide assistance before and during court appearances, such as court worker programs, legal assistance programs, and sentencing advisory bodies. Some Nations operate their own courts and conflict resolution programs. In the corrections stage, some Nations as well as some urban Indigenous organizations, operate their own jails, juvenile detention centers, and probation and parole programs. Some Indigenous agencies provide prison

[3] Research is still being carried out on all four organizations. The data on three of the organizations were updated in the summer of 2000; the fourth is still under investigation.

programs that liaise between prisoners and the community, and organize spirituality programs. Some agencies also offer programs that are part of the offenders' after care treatment such as substance abuse counseling, mental health counseling, and some of the prevention programs mentioned above.

Based on the history of the four organizations and the findings of several research studies and government task forces (see for example, Royal Commission, 1996; Cawsey, 1991; Siedschlaw and Gilbert, 1994), it would be safe to say that all of these programs were developed because of the ineffectiveness of the Canadian and American criminal justice systems in dealing with Indigenous offenders. Their position in the criminal justice system is that of an adjunct to state-operated systems (except for Organization D which is part of a tribal government system) [4].

Each of the four organizations analyzed in this paper was established specifically to provide a service or series of services that were not available to Indigenous offenders.

Organization A was about 30 years old, located in western Canada, had over 100 employees (the majority of whom are Indigenous people from a number of different Nations), and provided a wide variety of justice-related services, including: youth crime prevention programs, court services, parole and probation supervision, prison management, and educational programs that were aimed at Indigenous offenders or people at risk of offending. It provided services in large urban areas, small communities, and both on and off-reserve. Its head office was in a large urban area, but it had branch offices scattered around the province in areas of high Indigenous

[4] It could be argued that many members of the Euro-based criminal justice system would call any tribal justice system an adjunct system, as well.

population density. Its first service was providing information in court to Indigenous offenders. After word spread to other Indigenous communities about the services, demand grew for assistance outside the urban center. The Indian center that provided the program had a mandate limited to the city. With the encouragement of a few concerned judges and members of potential government funding bodies, the soon-to-be founder of Organization A left the center. The organization had to win the support of each local judge in order to speak in court and each local police officer in order to see clients in police cells. Each new program had to win over a new group of funding organizations, and develop relationships with members of the criminal justice system and Indigenous organizations. Each new community office had to develop relationships with the local criminal justice personnel and local Indigenous community leaders. The Organization met with resistance from Indigenous community members, non-Indigenous criminal justice members and some Indigenous political organizations as it developed, but was well-established by the time of the research.

Organization B was started about 30 years, located in the southwest United States, had about 30 employees (the majority of whom were Native Americans), and provided a variety of services only some of which were criminal justice-related. Its justice programs included a crime prevention program and substance abuse counseling. It offered another three programs that had many offenders among their clientele–a job training program, an adult education program, and a mental health counseling program. It provided services in one medium-sized urban center and the surrounding county.

The organization started as a social and recreational meeting place for local and transient Indigenous people. One of its first service programs was

substance abuse counseling which was established in response to community concerns about public drinking by Indigenous individuals. Its crime prevention youth program was added when another non-Indigenous organization offered it to the agency. Referrals to these and other Organization programs were made by other service organizations and self-referrals. The Organization had recently gone through a period of leadership turmoil, the results of which were still being felt in the Organization's relationship with its environment. The Organization was well-established but it had lost some programs and there remained a need to provide on-going educational work with new members of the various service domains. Because the primary focus of the organization was not criminal justice, interactions with this domain were limited, although staff felt a need to improve them with an eye to expanding programs in that area.

Organization C was about 10 years old, located in western Canada, had an unknown number of volunteers (but likely well over 150), operated in about 20 communities [5], and provided either sentencing advice to youth court judges, or diversion services for youth in trouble with the criminal justice system. Each community had a committee of anywhere from 6 to 30 volunteers that formed smaller groups to hear cases recommended to them by the court or the police.

The organization started in a small isolated community when local Elders expressed their frustration with young people being sent out of the community after committing offences. The judge suggested that a clause in the current young offender legislation might allow them to operate as a

[5]This number is very approximate because Organization A and the provincial government counted the committees using different criteria.

community sentencing advisory body. The Elders organized such a group and worked out the procedures. They and other committees received developmental and administrative assistance members of Organization A, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the provincial department of justice. Within a few years the idea had spread to other Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities, and expanded to encompass a second kind of committee that focused on alternative measures. Most committees in Indigenous communities provide sentencing advisory services. The committees were welcomed by many members of the criminal justice system but were resisted by others. The provincial government officially supported them as long as they met certain criteria (such as having a written constitution). Some committees operated without official designation. If the local judge was not willing to work with a committee then there was no chance of one succeeding. Some lawyers were also resistant to the committees since lawyers were not allowed to take part in the proceedings. Each committee had to develop its own relationship with the local criminal justice system, community members, and the provincial government. Interactions occurred on a daily or weekly basis, not only with court personnel but with police, probation and other justice personnel who had an interest in each case.

Organization D was about 20 years old, located in the southwest of the United States, and was an organization within a branch of an American Indian government. It had about 250 members. Its members provided alternative dispute resolution services on a part-time basis throughout the reservation. The members were not paid directly by the organization but were paid a nominal fee by the disputants. The organization had a head office located in the capital of the Nation. The organization trained and

oversaw the conduct of its members. The members received administrative support from court staff. The local judges also had oversight over the process if they referred a case for dispute resolution. The majority of the cases were self-referrals.

The Organization was started when tribal judges became dissatisfied with the adversarial court process. Many members of the Nation had very different expectations of the justice process and were not served well by the courts. Under the leadership of the head of the judicial branch and a few judges, a dispute resolution program was set up, but no tribal funding was available to provide the coordination, administrative support and training needed. In the meanwhile, a few judges made informal arrangements with qualified community members to provide a minimal level of services. About 10 years later, outside funding became available to establish an administrative office and a training program. Shortly thereafter the organization received sufficient tribal funds to pay a director and secretary. Initial program development work was done by members of the judicial branch, and later taken over by the director. The judicial branch members did a great deal of the funding negotiation, public relations work inside and outside the Nation, and educational work with tribal criminal justice personnel and community leaders. While there was support from both community members and tribal criminal justice groups, there was also some resistance to a traditionally-based justice program. The organization had very little direct relationship with the non-tribal criminal justice system.

In summary, each organization had a very different history of development, but all were responding to the needs of the Indigenous community for more culturally appropriate and effective justice services,

and all had a need for leadership in local and sometimes centralized locations.

Background on Leadership

What exactly is leadership? Hall (1999: 135-6) quotes Etzioni in describing leadership as "the ability, based on the personal qualities of the leader, to elicit the followers' voluntary compliance in a broad range of matters." Leadership is not the same as management. Hall points out that leaders "really do not engage in supervisory behavior" and have different tasks than managers (1999:136). Leaders' tasks, according to Selznick (1957:62-64), include defining the organization's mission and role, incorporating policy into the structure, defending the organization's integrity, and ordering internal conflict. Hall (1999) places the emphasis not so much on the power of the leader's position, but on his or her ability to persuade or influence others, and his or her "innovativeness in ideas and decision-making" (p. 137). There is no distinct set of characteristics that define a successful leader, rather, "the position in the organization itself, the specific situations confronted, the characteristics of the individuals involved, and the nature of the relationship with subordinates all affect leadership behavior and the impact of that behavior." (Hall, 1999: 153).

In this paper, it will be argued that Indigenous leadership can be described using Hall's dimensions of leadership; however, there is more to Indigenous leadership than his description implies. Indigenous leaders must have additional knowledge and skills because of a number of factors rooted in the colonial history and experiences of Indigenous peoples. These environmental influences include but are not limited to: the need to develop and lead effective programs for Indigenous clients; the special laws effecting

Indigenous peoples; the legal and political relationships between Indigenous peoples and neo-colonial governments; the cultural, economic and political aspirations of Indigenous communities; discriminatory beliefs and actions on the part of important environmental constituents; and differences between Indigenous and non-Indigenous expectations of leadership (see Nielsen, 1996a). These factors will not be discussed in any detail in this paper but form the context in which the data must be understood.

Indigenous Leadership

Leadership has extraordinary importance in Indigenous organizations because of the many obstacles these organizations face in their development. In Canada, for example, new Indigenous organizations have a very high liability of newness, that is, a very low success rate, with most disappearing soon after formation (Singh et al, 1986; Frideres, 1993:478). Indigenous organizations face a wide range of internal and environmental challenges that have developed as a result of the colonial processes mentioned earlier. These include but are not limited to: securing sufficient resources of all kinds from funding to staff to legitimacy, competition from other service organizations, legal restrictions, justifying the use of cultural values and practices, organizational isomorphism, and responding to discrimination (see, for example, Nielsen, 1993, 1996a). Unquestionably, understanding the leadership that guided them through these many difficulties is a necessary part of understanding the organizations' successful survival.

In the rest of this section the four dimensions of leadership suggested by Hall (1999) will be used to analyze the case study organizations to determine the fit of his framework, and where additional factors may be at play.

1) Position of leader within the organization

Position within the organization, according to Hall (1999: 137), refers to the leader being in the top level where he or she can exercise power "simply by giving orders and making decisions." As mentioned previously, there is a difference between managing and leading. In organizations where leaders must do both, their position is more complex. In an organization that has no easily recognizable "top level", leadership is also complex.

Some of the case study organizations at first glance, didn't seem to have leaders, but leadership may difficult to recognize if the researcher is from a different culture. Jules (1988: 8), for example, described a historical incident as follows: "the Europeans were baffled in their attempts to trace the sources of political authority. No one seemed in charge of anything..." On the other hand, some of the case study organizations had very formal hierarchies with a leader at the top; however, the structure became more ambiguous when the local level was examined.

Organization A had an executive director, two service directors, and a line of regional managers all located in the head office, and front-line supervisors located in each region. It had a board of directors comprised of Indigenous peoples, male and female, the majority of whom were Elders. Organization A was led by its founder until about five years ago, when a younger, long-time member of management replaced him on his retirement. Organization A's previous leader was essential in developing the support and working relationships with government leaders, criminal justice personnel and Indigenous leaders that allowed each program to develop, but a great deal of leadership during this developmental time also came from local Organization personnel in developing local relationships. The director traveled to the offices a great deal but day to day decision-making was often

made by local staff or their regional supervisors. The director gave these individuals a great deal of power out of necessity. Organization A had the appearance of a bureaucratic organization with leadership concentrated at the top, but because of the geographic dispersion of the offices, and the expertise of local staff about local cultures, issues, needs, resources and goals, there was defusing of some leadership tasks to the front-line. The new leader also followed a policy of delegating leadership responsibilities down the organization and leaving the local front-line workers with a great deal of autonomy in decision-making.

Organization B had an executive director who supervised all program staff. Each program had a coordinator, but this person did not supervise other program staff. It had a board of directors comprised of both Native American and non-Native Americans, male and female, most of whom worked professionally in areas similar to the programs offered by the agency. The organization had gone through many leaders in its 30 year history. Some were more effective than others in establishing new programs and maintaining interactions with the Organization's main constituents. During times of particularly effective leadership, decision-making and other leadership tasks were handled by the director, during times of leadership turmoil some leadership tasks were picked up by program staff when time allowed. At the time of the research, leadership was quite stable and most decision-making was done by the director.

Organization C had no central administrative body [6] and no leadership as such, except at the local level. It received policy advice and some

[6] It can be argued that these committees are an organization if Scott's definition is used: "Organizations are systems of interdependent activities linking shifting coalitions of participants; the systems are embedded in–dependent on continuing exchanges with and constituted by–the environments in which they operate." (1998:28). The committees are

administrative assistance from Organization A, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and the provincial government. Organization A had provided a coordinator while the committees were first getting started, and this person handled a lot of decision-making about where committees could be introduced next and where the Organization should offer its program development services; however, the position was abolished when Organization A suffered funding cuts. Nevertheless, even when the coordinator position existed, local leadership was key in developing the committees and maintaining interaction with important constituents. The number of committees was still expanding with leadership provided by local community members. Local committee members made all decisions about committee operation.

Organization D had an executive director and one clerical staff member. Decision-making for the Organization was split. The director handled most interactions with Indigenous criminal justice personnel and community leaders; however, decision-making about policy and direction, as well as a significant proportion of the public relations work with non-Indigenous criminal justice personnel and the general public outside the Nation, were done by judicial branch personnel.

It is clear that Leadership operated differently within each organization. Centralized decision-making was essential, if there was a central administrative unit, but this decision-making was not always done by a member of the Organization. Sometimes it was done by members of an

---

interdependent through their relationship with in the provincial youth courts, are comprised of shifting coalitions of community volunteers, are involved in continuing exchanges with the organizations mentioned earlier, and are embedded within Indigenous communities and the provincial criminal justice system. As well, the committees have similar though not identical goals, structures, and services.

over-sight organization such as with Organization D. Other duties normally associated with a leader also might be done by members of other cooperating organizations. Leadership by local personnel was especially essential, especially in gaining the cooperation and support of local criminal justice personnel and Indigenous community leaders.

This decentralization of decision-making clearly reflects traditional leadership structures which operated at the local level. Traditional leaders led at the local level and by consensus. As long as they effectively fulfilled the tasks of leadership, they kept their position. If the community decided that the leader was no longer capable, a new leader was chosen (Jules, 1988). The four case study organizations clearly show that leadership can be located in diverse positions inside, and outside, Indigenous justice organizations.

2) Specific situations confronted

Indigenous organizations are open systems tied to their environments, which both surround them and penetrate them (Scott, 1998). Organizations are completely dependent on their environment for their resources, in fact, organizational survival can be viewed as the process of using and acquiring resources from the environment (Morgan, 1997). These resources include funding, personnel, staff, information, some staff training, technologies, social support, structural forms, power, legitimacy, and clients (Kotter, 1979, Scott, 1998; Ritti and Silver, 1986; Morgan, 1997). If there are few alternative sources of resources, then the organizations become dependent on the resource provider. This resource dependency puts constraints on the autonomy and even the survival of the organization (Pfeffer and Salanchik, 1978; Scott, 1998). As a result, organizations try to actively manage their

dependencies (Kotter, 1979). It is the job of the leader to ensure that these dependencies are managed.

In order to understand which organization-environment relationships that Indigenous justice organization leaders must manage, it is necessary to briefly describe their environments. Hall's (1999:207-14) seven environmental dimensions provide an appropriate analytical framework.

Organization A's environment can be summarized as follows:

1) demographic--Indigenous peoples in the province were about 13% of the population, with slightly fewer than 50 % living in urban areas. All were eligible for Organization A's services, although those living on reserves might have alternative sources of assistance. Non-Indigenous peoples were eligible for all services, but remained a small portion of the clients.

2) economic--the funding for the organization had gone through several boom and bust cycles. The organization's economic peak was in the early 1980's. It was funded primarily by the federal government, though the province also provided a significant proportion. There were no other sources of funding large enough to cover the costs of the major programs.

3) legal--the organization had no legal mandate for its court and preventions programs, although the policies of various provincial and federal government bodies supported its programs. The correctional programs were operated under federal legislation regarding Indigenous offenders.

4) political--while the Organization had developed a great deal of political support over the years, there was growing pressure from Indigenous Nations to let them take over Organization services provided on their lands; there was a great deal of support for this move from federal and provincial government bodies. There was no indication this political trend would stop. The previous director of the Organization was described by many as one of

the most powerful Indigenous "small p" political leaders in the country, and had used his influence on behalf of the organization to stem this tide for a time. The new director dealt with these demands on regular basis.

5) technological--the Organization relied on the knowledge of its staff and board members concerning Indigenous values and practices, client needs, community needs, and community resources and issues. A pool of potential new staff and board members was available.

6) ecological--the organization was complementary to the state-run criminal justice system. It was in competition for funding with tribal organizations and some non-Indigenous-operated private service agencies. From another ecological standpoint, the organization had to have offices and staff located across the province because of the dispersed and isolated nature of many Indigenous communities.

7) cultural--the Indigenous Nations in the province and the country were undergoing a cultural revitalization movement. The organization was under pressure from Indigenous communities and political organizations to incorporate more Indigenous values and processes in its programs and administration. On the other hand, pressures toward organizational isomorphism came from funding agencies who wanted the Organization to be more bureaucratic in structure and function. The organization had to walk a line between these two different cultural demands in order to maintain its legitimacy with both groups.

Organization B's environment can be summarized as follows:

1) demographic conditions–the Indigenous population of the county was about 30 %. There was a great deal of migration between several nearby reservations and the city. Only Indigenous peoples living off-reservation, and in the urban area or in the surrounding county were eligible for

Organization services. Many of the clients were eligible for services from competing organizations if they returned to the reservations. Several but not all Organization programs were open to non-Indigenous clients. Non-Indigenous people were a very small proportion of Organization clients.

2) economic–the organization received its funding from federal, state, county and municipal governments. It also received grants from charitable foundations. The organization's funding peak was in the mid 1980's and it lost or cut back several programs after that. There were alternative sources of funding available and as a result the organization had recently hired a grant-writer.

3) legal–many of the Organization's programs were mandated through clauses in a wide variety of state and federal legislation, and had contract restrictions on their jurisdiction. Its substance abuse program was state licensed. Some of the programs had no need for legal mandate. Because of the number of legal clauses under which its programs operated, the agency was quite vulnerable to changes in law.

4) political–the organization was concerned about recent political initiatives to return some federal funding authority to American Indian Nations, thereby giving these Nations decision-making powers over some federal funding to urban Indigenous organizations. Such a political change could seriously affect several of the Organization's larger programs. Because Indigenous peoples in urban areas have little political power, there was little the Organization could do to manage this possible change.

5) technological–the organization relied on the knowledge of its staff and board members about Indigenous values and practices, client needs, community needs, and community resources. The board also provided information about developments and issues in their areas of professional

expertise. There was a pool of potential new staff and board members available.

6) ecological–the organization was in competition for resources with other non-Indigenous service organizations federally, in the state, in the city and in the county; however, the most serious competition was with a large and very powerful tribal government nearby. From another ecological standpoint, the organization was limited by the great distances in the southwest; the organization didn't have the funding to provide services in other non-reservation areas where there was a demand. The hiring of a grant-writer was seen as an important first step in better handling this competition.

7) cultural–the community in which the Organization provided services had a continuum of adherence to traditional Indigenous values. Because of legitimacy problems in the late 1950's and early 1960's, many of the programs offered by the surrounding Indigenous Nations were based on European justice models. There were movements in these Nations to move toward more traditional practices but these were still being greeted by some resistance. In the United States in general, there is resistance to incorporating Indigenous practices into the criminal justice system. The Organization incorporated cultural values and practices in some of its programs and not in others.

Organization C's environment can be summarized as follows:

1) demographic conditions–were the same as Organization A's provincially. About 6 % of the youth population in the province country was Indigenous and they were over-represented in the criminal justice system. Locally, the population density of Indigenous peoples determined the clientele so that in an Indigenous community the clients were mainly Indigenous; in a mixed Indigenous/ non-Indigenous community, the clients could be either.

2) economic–the organization received little funding and its members could not be remunerated by law. All organizational members had to be volunteers. Funding for special events such as travel to conferences or training was raised through grants. There was dissatisfaction in some communities about this, with committee members seeing it as another means of exploiting those individuals who could least afford it, the Indigenous elderly. Because of the law, no major changes were possible, although the department of justice recently instituted a small special grant program.

3) legal–the organization was mandated through young offenders legislation. There was some concern among criminal justice system members that the committees' sentencing recommendations might lead to legal challenges but this hadn't occurred yet. There were many communities in the province that didn't have a committee, and there were also concerns among criminal justice system members that this could lead to charges of unfairness in sentencing.

4) political–Some Indigenous political organizations expressed a desire to set up their own committees to assist youth only from their Nation.

5) technological-the committees relied on the knowledge and experience of their members in the areas of individual and family histories, community resources, and traditional Indigenous counseling techniques. There was some resistance from community members and criminal justice personnel who were afraid that the restorative justice approach used by the committees were "too easy" on the young offenders. There was a pool of potential new committee members available.

6) ecological–the committees were not in competition with any other service organization. They did face issues of isolation and distance, however, putting a financial strain on commuting committee members.

7) cultural–Because of the cultural revitalization movement mentioned under Organization A above, there was a strong expectation in Indigenous communities that the committees would use traditional practices. In mixed communities, there was less of this expectation, although the emphasis on holism and healing was still present. With the lessening impact of culture on some Indigenous young people, some people raised the issue that traditional ways would be meaningless for these young people and that committee members would have to have a different kind of knowledge.

Organization D's environment can be summarized as follows:

1) demographic conditions–the population served by the Organization was over 90% Indigenous, although occasionally non-Indigenous people and organizations involved in a dispute with a tribal member would take part in dispute resolution. The organization served only the Nation, which was quite large. It served mainly clients with civil disputes but was open to handle any criminal dispute brought to it, including rape and family violence.

2) economic–the organization was dependent on funding from the Nation's government, which was steadily suffering cuts as a result of Congressional actions. Grants applications were made to finance special research, and educational and other projects, but an alternative for operational funding had not been found. Only a handful of individual members made their living by doing dispute resolution. Recently there have been discussions about privatizing dispute resolution in order to better pay the members.

3) legal–the Organization was specifically mandated under tribal legislation. Its potential clientele had recently increased when the Nation legislated that all misdemeanor crimes be referred to dispute resolution.

4) political–the Organization was seen as a means of increasing the sovereignty of the tribe by assigning prominence to its traditional justice

practices; however, there had been some resistance from local political leaders who preferred to see such a successful program under their control and from local police who saw the service as impeding crime control.

5) technological–the Organization relied on the knowledge of its members about traditional Indigenous dispute resolution techniques, community resources, and family and individual problems. Not all members were involved in traditional spirituality; some used Christian or Native American Church concepts in their work. A pool of potential new members was available.

6) ecological–the Organization was a formal component of the tribal justice system. It was given the same status as the tribal courts; however, there were some judges and some police officers who saw the Organization as infringing on their domain. All components of the criminal justice system were in competition for very scarce funding from the tribal government, with funding coming ultimately from the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Ecological concerns related to distance or climate were not mentioned.

7) cultural–the original reason for beginning the organization was the cultural inappropriateness of the Euro-based tribal criminal justice system. This movement came from the community, through the judges. The Nation contained many members who saw themselves as "traditionals", and the Euro-based tribal justice system as ineffective. On the other hand, there were some tribal members who had come to trust the Euro-based system and they resisted cooperating with the Organization (if they worked for the criminal justice system), or asking for the Organization's services as clients.

In summary, the organizations were faced with obtaining a wide range of very important resources from their environments. The three most important environmental dimensions seemed to be the economic, cultural

and a combination of the legal/political. Each of these dimensions presented challenges to obtaining the two most needed resources--funding and support. In obtaining these resource, leaders had to negotiate with four constituencies: government and other funding bodies, other criminal justice personnel, Indigenous communities, and the general public. Of these, the three most important were funding bodies, criminal justice system members, and Indigenous community members.

Probably one of the most important tasks performed by the leadership of Indigenous justice organizations, therefore, was to "manage" the Organizations' environments (as well as the organizations). They had to scan the environment for resource opportunities and threats to resources; they had to negotiate resource acquisition, and they had to avoid too severe a degree of dependency. They also needed to adapt the organization to fit changes in the environment and to try to change the environment to meet the needs of the organization (Scott, 1998).

In Organization A ensuring that resources were obtained was the task of the director. In Organization B this was usually the task of the director but during times of leadership turmoil the tasks were sometimes handled by program staff. In Organization C, obtaining resources was first taken care of by local committee members with the assistance of the coordinator from Organization A, then later just by the local committee members. In Organization D, some of the resource acquisition was handled by the judicial branch, the remainder by the director. The members were responsible for obtaining their own clients and pay. In brief, the strategies for allocating resource acquisition tasks were developed by the organizations in response to their internal leadership resources.

Another important aspect of managing the environment is developing effective strategies for doing it. These are the subject for another paper, but here is one example. A highly successful strategy was to play the dependency on one resource group off against the dependency on another. Organization A, for example, was dependent on a federal government granting body that decreed in the funding contract that the organization had to provide a job descriptions for the Elders it employed. The Organization responded that to ask Elders to develop a job description would be the height of disrespect as disrespect is defined in Indigenous communities, and the Organization would thereby risk losing its legitimacy with its clients, potential staff members and political supporters. The federal funder quickly withdrew its demands.

3) Characteristics of the individuals

Research has shown that great care must be taken in claiming that one set of traits determine a good leader. Individual traits are only meaningful in the context of the situations the leader must handle. As Hall (1999: 138) states, "the set of conditions of the moment–the situation–defines by whom and in what manner leadership will be exercised." The previous discussion has provided a brief overview of the conditions in which Indigenous leadership operates.

In order to communicate with all their important constituents in the environment, the leaders of Indigenous justice organizations must have traits that earn their respect. In order to be seen as legitimate by many Indigenous community members, Indigenous leaders have to have some of the traits of traditional leadership. In earlier times, leaders were chosen for their personal traits. Their status was the result of "competence, service, exploits and kin connections" (Boldt, 1980: 22). They were facilitators or "effectors" (Boldt,

1980). They were chosen for their personal integrity, honesty, and the respect they evoked (Jules, 1988). Jules (1988) also described leadership qualities as: being close to the people, serving rather than bossing, keeping people informed, and having humility.

Accepted Indigenous leadership traits have changed to some extent since earlier times. Boldt (1980), for example, described the "average" Canadian Indigenous leader of the 1970's as being male, young, better educated than other Indigenous people, earning a higher income, adopting a predominantly non-Indigenous lifestyle, and living in an urban center (among other traits). Even so, Indigenous leaders were still respected for their humility, their ability to motivate others, and for not losing touch with people (Jules, 1988).

My research found that this newer "model" did have validity in describing the centralized leadership of the case study organizations; however, there was some holdover of the earlier leadership expectations especially in the early developmental stages of an organization and at the local level. In Organization A, the previous leader who was of Indigenous ancestry, was described variously as a visionary, having a sincere understanding of the Indigenous community, being practical, being egalitarian, having an excellent network of contacts, being committed to the organization, being politically astute, being a role model, being caring, being open to new ideas, and being a mentor [7]. The most recent leader was described by staff as being culturally sensitive, hard-working, and business-like.

---

[7] More data is needed to show that these are reflections of traditional leadership and not indications of a Euro-based supportive leadership style.

Research is not yet completed on Organization B but some traits were mentioned by respondents. Expectations of leadership included: being of Indigenous ancestry, having a network of contacts in order to obtain funding, being a hands-on supervisor, being open to communication with staff, and putting family first.

In Organization C, leadership was at the local level. Very similar kinds of individuals served on the committees. They were often male and female community leaders. In Indigenous communities, members were often Indigenous Elders; in small urban communities they were a mix of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, often Elders or professional people. The number of Elders was decreasing in all committees. Committee members had to be very knowledgeable about the community, its people, and its resources. They had to care about the juveniles and want to help them.

In Organization D, some local leadership tasks were carried out by members. The local members were Indigenous men and women who spoke well and wisely, were non-authoritarian, and were persuasive. They had to have special knowledge of conflict resolution practices, and traditional Indigenous or other spiritual values. They were perceived by the community as having character, having the ability to plan, and being wise. They were highly respected by the community. They were seen as community leaders. No data was collected about the desired characteristics of the director or the judicial branch administrators.

In dealing with their non-Indigenous and some Indigenous constituents, Indigenous leaders had to have leadership skills as these skills were recognized by non-Indigenous justice organizations. For example, Yukl, cited in Hall (1999: 139) lists leadership traits and skills as:

managerial motivation, self-confidence, energy level, emotional maturity, technical skills, human relations skills, conceptual skills and physical attributes. In order to obtain resources for the organizations, the leaders had to have knowledge of funding opportunities and priorities, contact people and personnel changes, job duties of key justice personnel, political trends and changes, and non-Indigenous communication skills, among other things.

In Organization A, the leaders had a wide array of contacts among non-Indigenous government and criminal justice system members. People saw them as "professional". Nevertheless, a great deal of emphasis was put on traditional leadership skills, and very little mention was made of bureaucratic skills. In Organization B, some leaders were praised for their professionalism, and network of contacts in government and non-Indigenous organizations. In Organization C, some comments were made about the organizing skills of some committee members, but most of the emphasis was on the traditional skills of committee members. In Organization D, the desirability of bureaucratic skills for leadership was not mentioned; emphasis was only on traditional skills.

After assessing these traits, it seems likely that leaders of centralized, urban Indigenous organizations needed to have the ability to operate in both Indigenous and non-Indigenous environments. This has been called "walking in two worlds". The centralized leader must be neither the traditional Indigenous leader, nor the bureaucratic leader. In local communities the desired traits of a leader seemed be closer to traditional conceptions. An important variable here might be that these local leaders had very little interaction with funders, and had few or no management duties.

This emphasis on traditional traits even in centralized urban organizations raised some interesting questions about the "visibility" of bureaucratic traits in Indigenous organizations. These organizations existed because they were perceived as being more effective than non-Indigenous organizations that offered similar services. Were bureaucratic traits not mentioned because they were rare, because they were so common they were invisible, or because there were political reasons related to legitimacy that led to emphasizing traditional traits over bureaucratic traits?

4) The relationship between the leadership and subordinates

Data were still being gathered on this dimension. One indicator of the relationship between leaders and subordinates was management style. Pre-contact Indigenous leaders in general, operated by consensus and were very egalitarian in their relationship with other community members, as mentioned earlier. This is can be related to the Euro-based management concepts of authoritarian and supportive leadership. The supportive leader is employee-oriented, democratic, and considerate. He or she uses consultative decision-making and supervises loosely. The authoritarian leaders rely on the power of their position and their ability to punish (Hall, 1999: 140-1). Traditional Indigenous leaders would be described today as supportive leaders.

The leaders in the four organizations were all supportive managers to varying degrees. There was almost no variation. In Organization A, data was already presented that suggested the leaders were democratic, used consultative decision-making and supervised loosely. In Organization B, the current leader was less democratic, used less consultative decision-making and supervised more closely, although all of these indicators were still well within the supportive range of the continuum. Organization C had leadership

only at the local level, and it was very democratic, very consultative in its decision-making and had no supervision. Organization D's leadership was very complex. The relationship between the coordinator and the members was very democratic. He had very little authority over them, and didn't supervise them. He made very few decisions that affected them.

A second indicator and one on which data are still being gathered is subordinates' perception of the right of the leader to the position. Subordinates must perceive the leader as having a legitimate right to the position, that his or her position and behavior is correct and appropriate (Scott, 1998). This right is based on two things, the power of the leader's position, and the behavior of the leader being such that the expectations of his or her followers are fulfilled (Hall, 1999). Traditionally, Indigenous leaders did not emphasize the power of their positions, although traditional values suggest that they would be honored for their accomplishments in achieving the position (see Dumont, 1993). Research on today's Indigenous leadership suggest that this pattern remains in that leaders, for example, are expected to be humble, to lead by example, and to be good, stable, caring individuals (Jules, 1988; Redpath and Nielsen, 1997).

Leaders in the four case study organizations did not seem to emphasize their power, although some minor staff complaints might indicate staff consciousness of their leaders' power. More data needs to be gathered here.

In Organization A there was an emphasis on the caring shown by leaders towards staff who had personal and family issues. This was also the case in Organization B. Organizations C and D did not have the kind of leadership about which this kind of information existed. Staff in both Organizations A and B also emphasized that their leaders expected them to

be caring of their clientele. Both Organizations C and D had similar program emphases but this could not be linked directly to leadership.

Also still being investigated is whether Indigenous subordinates have expectations about their leaders' Indigenous knowledge and skills, and their non-Indigenous, bureaucratized knowledge and skills. Based on previous research in the area, it is likely that they will expect their leaders to be able to operate effectively within the four conflicting constituencies (Nielsen, 1993). However, depending on the degree of "traditional" or "western" affiliation of the subordinate, the subordinate could have very different expectations of how the leader balances these knowledges and skills and, therefore, award their leader different degrees of legitimacy.

Boldt (1980) suggests that Indigenous leaders find it difficult to remain in leadership roles for more than two or three years because, while establishing credibility and status in non-Indigenous society, they lose legitimacy among their Indigenous constituents. Completely speculating, the direction of the present research suggests that there may be another related reason--that if enough of their subordinates within the organization refuse them legitimacy because the leader does not fulfill their expectations of a "proper" Indigenous" leader, his or her tenure may also be short.

Conclusion

Morgan (1997: 189) in discussing organizations as political systems, remarks that leadership "ultimately involves an ability to define the reality of others." In Indigenous justice (and other) organizations, this ability and task are essential to the survival of the organizations. Because of colonial processes, Indigenous peoples have been defined as incompetent and inferior to non-Indigenous peoples. This Social Darwinist attitude still exists and has

been extended to Indigenous organizations. Indigenous leaders must have the skills and knowledge to redefine Indigenous organizations as competent, effective and worthy of receiving resources. This redefinition must certainly occur in managing the environment of the organization but also in leading subordinates. Because the constituencies of Indigenous justice organizations have conflicting expectations of how services will be provided and leadership be carried out, leaders of centralized organizations must have the appropriate knowledge and skills to "walk in two worlds", that is to perform their leadership tasks in both Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities. Local level leaders must have the knowledge and skills appropriate to their community. While some of these may not be culturally-based, many of them will be.

Knowing the complexity of the leadership role in an Indigenous organization may assist today's Indigenous leaders as well as non-Indigenous educational institutions to develop more effective training and mentoring programs for the next generation of Indigenous leaders. It may also help today's Indigenous leaders gain a new perspective on their own skill development needs.

A great deal of research remains to be done. My research so far clearly suggests that culture DOES make a difference. Successful Indigenous leaders must have additional knowledge and skills so that they can work effectively with Indigenous and non-Indigenous constituents. Additional research is needed, however to investigate the influence of other possible factors on Indigenous leadership such as professionalization initiatives and the adoption of social service ideologies. Even with these factors, however, it is likely that cultural difference will still play a role.

References

Bachman, Ronet. 1992. Death and Violence on the Reservation: Homicide, Family Violence, and Suicide in American Indian Populations. New York: Auburn House.

Boldt, Menno. 1993. Surviving as Indians: the Challenge of Self-Government. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Boldt, Menno. 1980. "Canadian Native Indian Leadership: Context and Composition." Canadian Ethnic Studies. 12/ : 15-33.

Cawsey Commission. 1991. Report on the Task Force on the Criminal Justice System and Its Impact on the Indian and Metis People of Alberta, Volume 1. Edmonton: The Task Force.

Deloria, Vine, Jr. and Clifford M. Lytle 1983. American Indians, American Justice. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Dumont, James. 1993. "Justice and Aboriginal Peoples." Pp. 42-85 in Aboriginal Peoples and the Justice System edited by the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services.

Finn, Anne, Trevethan, Shelley, Carriere, Giselle and Melanie Kowalski. 1999. "Female Inmates, Aboriginal Inmates, and Inmates Serving Life Sentences: A One-Day Snapshot." Juristat. 19/5: 1- 14 (Statistics Canada Catalogue # 85-002-XIE).

Frideres, James S. 1993. Native Peoples in Canada: Contemporary Conflicts, 4th ed. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall.

Grobsmith, Elizabeth. 1994. Indians in Prison: Incarcerated Native Americans in Nebraska. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Hagan, William T. 1993. American Indians, 3rd Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hall, Richard H. 1999. Organizations: Structures, Processes, and Outcomes, Seventh Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Jules, Felicity. 1988. "Native Indian Leadership." Canadian Journal of Native Education. 15 /3:
3-23.

Kotter, Jon P. 1979. "Managing External Dependence." Academy of Management Review. 41/1: 87-92.

Mail, Patricia D and S. Johnson. 1993. "Boozing, Sniffing, and Toking: An Overview of the Past, Present, and Future of Substance Use by American Indians." American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research Journal. 5/2: 1-33.

Mankiller, Wilma and Michael Wallis. 1993. Wilma Mankiller: A Chief and Her Peoples. St. Martin's Press.

Miller, J.R. 1989. Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens, Rev. Ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Morgan, Gareth. 1997. Images of Organization, Second Edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Morse, Bradford W. 1985. Aboriginal Peoples and the Law: Indian, Metis, and Inuit Rights in Canada. Ottawa, ON: Carleton University Press.

Nielsen, Marianne O. 1996a. "A Comparison of Developmental Ideologies: Navajo Peacemaker Courts and Canadian Native Justice Committees." Pp. 207-223 in Restorative Justice: International Perspectives edited by Burt Galaway and Joe Hudson. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Nielsen, Marianne O. 1996b. "Contextualization for Native American Crime and Criminal Justice Involvement." Pp. 10-19 in Native Americans, Crime, and Justice edited by Marianne O. Nielsen and Robert A. Silverman. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Nielsen, Marianne O. 1993. "Surviving In-Between: A Case Study of a Canadian Aboriginal-Operated Criminal Justice Organization." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Nielsen, Marianne O. and Robert A. Silverman (eds.). 1996. Native Americans, Crime, and Justice. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey and Gerald R. Salanchik 1978. The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective. New York: Harper and Row.

Redpath, Lindsay and Marianne O. Nielsen.1997. "A Comparison of Native Culture, Non-Native Culture and New Management Ideology." Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences. 14/3: 327-339.

Ritti, R. Richard and Jonathan H. Silver 1986. "Early Processes of Institutionalization: The Dramaturgy of Exchange in Interorganizational Relations." Administrative Science Quarterly. 31/1: 25-42.

Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. 1996. Bridging the Cultural Divide: A Report on Aboriginal Peoples and Criminal Justice in Canada. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.

Scott, W. Richard. 1998. Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems, Fourth Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Selznick, Philip. 1957. Leadership in Administration: A Sociological Interpretation. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Siedschlaw, Kurt and James N. Gilbert. 1994. "Native Americans in Criminal Justice." Pp. 135-
153 in Multicultural Perspectives in Criminal Justice and Criminology edited by James E. Hendricks and Bryan Byers. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.

Silverman, Robert A. and Marianne O. Nielsen (eds.) 1992. Aboriginal Peoples and Canadian Criminal Justice. Toronto: Butterworths.

Singh, Jitendra V., Tucker, David J. and Robert J. House. 1986. "Organizational Legitimacy and the Liability of Newness." Administrative Science Quarterly. 31/2: 171-193.

Trigger, Bruce G. 1985. Natives and Newcomers. Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

U.S. Government, Bureau of Justice Statistics. 1999. Sourcebook, 1998. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Wright, Ronald C. 1992. Stolen Continents. Boston: Houghton Mifflen.

Wuttunee, Wanda A. 1992. In Business for Ourselves: Northern Entrepreneurs. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE

I. Document Identification:

Title: The Impact of Colonialism on Leadership in Indigenous-Operated Justice Organizations.

Author: Marianne O. Nielsen.

Corporate Source: Northern Arizona University? ESA Annual meeting

Publication Date: May 28-31, 2002

II. Reproduction Release:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please check one of the following three options and sign the release form.

Level 1 - Permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) and paper copy.

Level 2A - Permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

Level 2B - Permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

Sign Here: "I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: M.O Nielsen Position: Assoc. Professor

Printed Name: Marianne O. Nielsen Organization:

Address: Criminal Justice Telephone No: 928-523-6512
Box 15005 Date: April 22/02.
Northern Arizona
University, Flagstaff AZ 86001

III. Document Availability Information (from Non-ERIC Source):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the

RC023375

document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price per copy: Quantity price:

IV. Referral of ERIC to Copyright/Reproduction Rights Holder:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please complete the following:

Name:

Address:

V. Attach this form to the document being submitted and send both to:

Velma Mitchell, Acquisitions Coordinator
ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools
P.O. Box 1348
1031 Quarrier Street
Charleston, WV 25325-1348

Phone and electronic mail numbers:

800-624-9120 (Clearinghouse toll-free number)
304-347-0467 (Clearinghouse FAX number)
mitchelv@ael.org

Sorry for the delay responding. It's been a frantic semester.